



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,493	06/18/2001	Michael Aaron Kaply	AUS920010544US1	4152
35525 7590 03/23/2007 IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER VU, THANH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
2 MONTHS	03/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

MAR 23 2007

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/884,493
Filing Date: June 18, 2001
Appellant(s): KAPLY ET AL.

YEE & ASSOCIATS, P.C.
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Art Unit: 2174

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 11/08/2005 appealing from the Office action mailed 10/06/2004.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Art Unit: 2174

US 2002/0032731	Quian et al.	03-2002
6,369,840	Barnett et al.	04-2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-4, 7-16, 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Qian et al. ("Qian", Pub. No. US 2002/0032731).

Per claim 1, Qian teaches a method in a data processing system for removing information, the method comprising:

receiving a selection of confidential information for removal from a history (e.g. cookies) generated by a browser, wherein the selection is received prior to a browser session (col. 2, [0017]; col. 4, lines [0053]; col. 3, [0047]; col. 5, [0077]), and wherein the history is composed of multiple data elements generated by a browser (col. 5, [0072]);

identifying data elements within the history, that correspond to the confidential information that has been selected (col. 5, [0067], and [0071]); and

responsive to a termination of the browser session, automatically removing the selected confidential information from the history without requiring further user input upon termination of the browser session, wherein only the selected confidential information is removed without destroying the integrity of other portions of the history (col. 2, [0017]; col. 5, [0067], and [0071]).

Per claim 2, Qian teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the confidential information includes at least one of a phone number, a credit card number, a social security number, an

Art Unit: 2174

address of a user, user identification, a password, and a personal identification number (col. 3, [0047]; col. 5, [0067]).

Per claim 3, Qian teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the receiving step comprises: receiving the selection of confidential information as a user input (fig. 2A; col. 3, [0047]).

Per claim 4, Qian teaches the method of claim 3, wherein the user input is received through a graphical user interface (fig. 2A; col. 3, [0047]).

Per claim 7, Qian teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the confidential information is received as at least one string (fig. 2A; col. 3, [0047]).

Claims 8-9 are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claim 10 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

Claim 11 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Additionally, Qian teaches a data system comprising: a bus system, a communications unit connected to the bus system, a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; and a processing unit connected to the bus system (fig. 1; col. 3, [0045], and [0046]).

Claim 12 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11.

Claims 13-16, and 19 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-4, and 7 respectively.

Claims 20-22 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 8-10 respectively.

Claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Qian et al. ("Qian", Pub. No. US 2002/0032731) and Barnett et al ("Barnett", U.S. Pat. No. 6,369,840).

Per claim 6, Qian teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the history includes a cookie file, and data associated with Web pages, a location list, and a history list (fig. 3B; col. 3, [0048] col. 5, [0072]), but does not teach a cache for storing the data associated with Web pages, a location list, and a history list. However, Barnett teaches a cache for storing data (col. 6, lines 14-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a cache as taught by Barnett in the invention of Qian because it provides an improved performance by obviating the need for a direct connection.

Claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 6.

(10) Response to Argument

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments in the Amendment have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Appellant's primary argument is that Qian does not teach "a selection of confidential information for removal from a history generated by a browser, wherein the selection is received prior to a browser session". The examiner does not agree because Qian discloses that at a start of

Art Unit: 2174

group-browsing session, cookie manager routine is activated to intercept all cookies created during the group-browsing session. Once the session is ended the system automatically removes all cookies (col. 2, [0017]; col. 4, lines [0053]; col. 5, [0072]; [0077]). In this case, cookies are being used to contain confidential information ([0009]). Accordingly, Qian reads on the claim language of a selection of confidential information for removal from a history (e.g. cookies) generated by a browser, wherein the selection is received prior to a browser session.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


Thanh T. Vu

Conferees:


WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Weilun Lo


KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Kristine L. Kincaid